

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain pending in the application.

35 USC 112 Second Paragraph Rejection of Claims 2, 6 and 25

The Office Action rejected claims 2, 6 and 25 as allegedly being indefinite under 35 USC 112.

In particular, claim 2 was rejected for reciting the language "initiating a subsequent service to said first service" as allegedly unclear.

Claim 2 is amended herein to remove the rejected language.

In particular, claim 6 was rejected for reciting the language "said second service" as lacking antecedent basis.

Claim 2 is amended herein to remove the rejected language.

In particular, claim 25 was rejected as allegedly being unclear for reciting the acronym "JLDAP".

Claim 25 is amended herein to remove the acronym "JLDAP" and replace the acronym with its equivalent wording.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 6 and 25 are now in full conformance with 35 USC 112. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-25 over Roberts

In the Office Action, claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,792,605 to Roberts et al. ("Roberts"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-9 recite retrieving at a first server a location of a second server within a distributed environment storing at least one of an application program and data associated with a request from a client and transmitting a message object to a second server containing data associated with the request for servicing a client. Claims 10-18 a service-chaining module configured to be executed on each of a plurality of servers, wherein the service-chaining module is configured to retrieve a location of at least one of an application program and data associated with a received request, is configured to package the location of

the at least one of the application program and the data as an itinerary list into a message object, and is configured to transmit the message object to another server. Claims 19 and 20 recite transmitting a message object containing data associated with a request from a client to a second server and initiating transfer of at least one of an application program and data at the second server in response to a determination of the second server as a provider of the at least one of said application program and said data by a first server. Claims 21-25 recite a service-chaining module configured to receive a message object from another server containing an itinerary list of at least one of an application program and data in response to a request from one of a plurality of servers over a network, the service-chaining module is configured to perform transfer of an identified the at least one of the application program and data on the itinerary list on a selected server of a plurality of servers to a client.

Thus, Applicants' claimed features transfer a message object from one server to another server in response to a request from a client for transfer of at least one of an application program and data from the server containing the at least one of the application program and the data to the client.

Roberts appears to disclose a method and apparatus for accessing and using services and applications from a number of sources into a customized application (See Abstract). A centralized system receives a request for information via an HTTP interface using web services engine to interpret the request and determine what services are needed using a web services directory to identify services available to satisfy the request (See Roberts, col. 5, lines 12-18). When a response returns from its source, the web services engine builds the response into a reply to the HTTP request and provides it to the requester (See Roberts, col. 5, lines 18).

Roberts relies on a centralized system that collects information requested by a requester, the information being returned to the client by the centralized system **NOT** the source of the information. Roberts fails to disclose or suggest transfer of information from an information source, i.e., transferring a message object from one server to another server for transfer of at least one of

an application program and data from the server containing the at least one of the application program and the data to a client, as recited by claims 1-25.

A benefit of transferring a message object from one server to another server for transfer of at least one of an application program and data from the server containing the at least one of the application program and the data to a client is, e.g., reducing network traffic. Within the prior art, a centralized location within a distributed environment is relied on to collect information requested by a client. A centralized approach requires network traffic to transfer a request to the centralized location, network traffic to retrieve the information and network traffic to send the information from the centralized location to the client. Applicants' claimed features reduce the amount of network traffic by having a server that contains at least one of a requested application program and data to interface with a client. Applicants' claimed features eliminate network traffic associated with having to intermediately transfer information to a centralized system.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-25 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

2000 M Street, NW 7TH Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df